

CHAVRUTA

SHABBAT – DAF KUF MEM VAV

Translated by: *Chavruta staff of scholars*
Edited by: *R. Shmuel Globus*

[They also asked him: **Why are idolaters odorous?**

Because they did not stand at Mount Sinai. For] **at the time that the Primordial Snake** in the Garden of Eden deceived *Chavah*¹ into eating from the Tree of Knowledge, the Snake **had intimate relations with Chavah**. This is alluded to in the Torah, for the verse says: “The snake deceived me (*hishi’ani*)” which is from the same word as marriage (*nisu’in*). And at that time **he cast impurity into her**.

When **the Jewish people stood at Mount Sinai, their impurity ceased**. For everyone who stood there was sanctified, purified and healed from any blemish. But regarding **idolaters** i.e. the Gentiles, **who did not stand at Mount Sinai, their impurity did not cease**. And because of this, they remain impure until today.

Rav Acha son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: regarding **converts**, who were also not present at Mount Sinai, at **what** time did their impurity cease?

He said to him: even though they were not present at Mount Sinai, **their *mazal*** i.e. their guardian angels were there. And because of this, their impurity ceased. And as it is written (*Devarim*² 29:14), “**those who are standing here with us today before Hashem our G-d, and those who are not here** with us today.” I.e. even those that will attach themselves to the Jewish people in the future, although they are not here today at Sinai, are included in the covenant.

And this explanation **differs with the view of Rav Abba bar Kahana**.

¹ Eve

² Deuteronomy

PEREK 22 – 146A

For Rav Abba bar Kahana said: the impurity did not cease from our forefathers until three generations had passed. For Avraham fathered Yishmael, and Yitzchak fathered Eisav. However, from Yaakov and on, the impurity ceased. For he fathered twelve tribes in which there was no defect. So we see that the impurity ceased even before Sinai.

MISHNAH

A person may break a barrel on Shabbat with a knife or a sword, in order **to eat dried figs from it**, that is, to eat the figs that are contained inside the barrel. This is because he is merely destroying the barrel, and acts of this nature are not prohibited on Shabbat.

This is permitted, **as long as he does not intend** to bore a hole with a proper opening, **to make a** usable **utensil** from the barrel. For by doing so, he is putting the finishing touch to it and is liable for the forbidden work of *Makeh Bepatish*³.

And one may not bore the stopper of a barrel, since when he bores a hole he is making an opening to the barrel. Rather he must remove the entire stopper – **these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah**.

And the Sages permit a person to bore the stopper, because that is not the normal way of making an opening to a barrel.

And similarly, one may not bore a barrel in its side. The Gemara will explain this ruling.

³ Lit. "striking the final hammer blow". This category of work encompasses all types of making a utensil.

PEREK 22 – 146A

And if it, the barrel, **was** already bored, **one may not put wax on it**, i.e. on the hole. **Because** by doing so **he smears** it on the sides of the barrel, and it is considered a secondary form of the forbidden work of smoothing.

Said Rabbi Yehudah: an incident involving a man who put wax on an opening **came before Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakai in** the city of **Arab**. **And he**, Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakai, said: **I am concerned about him**, this man, **that he is liable** to bring a sin-offering. For maybe he smeared the wax.

GEMARA

It was taught in our Mishnah: A person may break a barrel on Shabbat with a knife or a sword, in order to eat dried figs from it.

Said Rav Oshia: the Mishnah **only taught** this law, in a case where the dried figs that are in the barrel are **pressed** and stuck together in one lump, and one needs an axe or a sword in order to cut them up and eat from them. Since one may move the sword in order to cut the dried figs, it is similarly permitted for him to break the barrel with it.

However, if the dried figs are **separated** (from each other), and a sword is not needed to cut them, one may **not** move the sword in order to break the barrel. And the Gemara will soon explain the reason for this.

They contradicted him, from a Baraita: **Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel says: a person may bring a barrel of wine, and sever its top with a sword, and place it before his guests on Shabbat, and does not need to be concerned**. Evidently, even when the sword is only needed to break the barrel, it is permitted to move it, for wine is not something that one cuts. And this poses a difficulty for Rav Oshia.

PEREK 22 – 146A

And the Gemara answers: **that** which Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel said, **is** like the view of the **Rabbis**. They said: all utensils may be moved on Shabbat, whether for its regular use or not for its regular use. However, **our Mishnah is like** the view of **Rabbi Nechemiah**. He said: a utensil may only be moved on Shabbat for its specific function. And a sword is not usually used to break a barrel. Therefore, it can not be moved for this purpose, unless he needs the sword to cut the dried figs, which is its regular usage. And since he is permitted to use it to cut the figs, he is also permitted to break the barrel with it.

*

And the Gemara asks: **And what forced Rabbi Oshia to set up our Mishnah in accordance with** the view of **Rabbi Nechemiah** and to say that it is specifically **referring to** dried figs that are **pressed**? **Let him set up** our Mishnah **as even referring to** dried figs that are **separated** from each other. And let him say that our Mishnah is **in accordance with** the view of **the Rabbis** who permitted moving a utensil even for an unusual use.

Said Rava: Rav Oshia set up our Mishnah in accordance with the view of Rabbi Nechemiah, because **our Mishnah posed a difficulty for him**.

For he had the following difficulty: **why did** our Mishnah **specifically teach** the case of **dried figs**? **Let it teach** the case of other **fruit** or produce. **Rather, hear from this** a proof that the Mishnah is only **referring to a case of pressed** dried figs, which need cutting. But it is prohibited to move a sword in order to break a barrel of fruit.

PEREK 22 – 146A

One Baraita taught: regarding **palm-baskets**⁴ of i.e. containing **dried figs or dates**. If they are tied with rope, **one may untie** them on Shabbat. **And** similarly **one may unravel** the rope. **And** similarly **one may cut** the rope.

The other Baraita taught: **one may untie** the rope. **But one may not unravel or cut** it.

And the Gemara resolves the contradiction between the two Baraitot: **it is not a difficulty**. **This Baraita** that allows one to unravel and cut **is** the view of **the Rabbis**. They permit one to move a knife for any need, including unraveling and cutting the rope with it.

And that Baraita that prohibited him to unravel or cut **is** the view of **Rabbi Nechemiah**. He prohibits moving a knife for this purpose, since that is not its designated function.

For it was taught in a Baraita: **Rabbi Nechemiah says:** **even** regarding a **spoon, or even a garment, or even a knife**, all of which are certainly not *muktzeh* – **one may only move them for their specified use**.

*

They posed an inquiry to Rav Sheishet: **what is** the law regarding **boring** a hole **in a wine barrel, using a spear, on Shabbat?**

Do we say: **he intends** to make **an opening, and** therefore it is **prohibited** since he is putting the finishing touch to the barrel?

Or perhaps, he intends **to** widen the flow of wine with a large hole so that it will be able to flow **generously, and** therefore this is **permitted**. Since he is not making a proper

⁴ Baskets made from palm fronds. One puts bad dates into them to help them ripen.

PEREK 22 – 146A

round hole, it shows that he does not intend to improve the barrel by making an opening. Therefore, there is no prohibition of putting the finishing touch to a utensil.

He, Rav Sheishet, said to him: he intends to make an opening, and therefore it is **prohibited**, since he is putting the finishing touch to the barrel.

They contradicted him, from a Baraita: **Rabbi Shimon ben Gamliel says: a person may bring a barrel of wine, and sever its top with a sword.** And he is not considered to be making an opening. And this presents a difficulty for Rav Sheishet.

And the Gemara answers: it is not a difficulty. There, regarding severing the top of the barrel, **he definitely intends to generate a generous** flow of wine. **Here**, however, regarding boring a hole with a spear, he intends to make an opening. For **if it is that he intends to generate a generous** flow of wine, he could have **opened** the stopper of the barrel. And since he did not do so, it shows that his intention was to make a proper opening for the barrel.

It was taught in our Mishnah: **one may not bore the stopper** of a barrel – these are the words of Rabbi Yehudah. And the Sages permit it. And, one may not bore a barrel in its side.

Said Rav Huna: there is a **disagreement** between Rabbi Yehudah and the Sages regarding the case where he bores **into the top** of the stopper. This is the only case that the Sages permitted, since it is not normal to make an opening there, but rather to remove the entire stopper.

PEREK 22 – 146A

But in the case where he bores **into the side** of the stopper, **everyone agrees** that it is **prohibited**. This is because it is normal to do this, as sometimes he does not want to remove the stopper, to avoid dirt and debris falling into the barrel.

And that which the Mishnah **teaches** further on, ‘**one may not bore** a barrel **into its side**’, refers to boring the stopper.

*

And Rav Chisda said: there is a **disagreement** between Rabbi Yehudah and the Sages regarding a case where a person bored **into the side** of the stopper. In this case Rabbi Yehudah prohibits it, since it is normal to make an opening there, as sometimes he does not want to remove the stopper, to avoid dirt and debris falling into the barrel. And the Sages permit even this case.

But in a case where he bores **into the top** of the stopper, everyone agrees that it is permitted, since it is certainly not the normal way of opening a barrel.

And that which the Mishnah **teaches** further on, ‘**one may not bore** a barrel **into its side**’, does not refer to boring the stopper. Rather, **there** it refers to boring **the barrel itself**. It is prohibited because he intends to make an opening, and this is a regular way of opening a barrel.

The Rabbis taught in a Baraita: **one may not bore a new hole** in a utensil **on Shabbat**. **But, if he is coming to add** to a pre-existing hole, to widen it, **he may add** to it.

And others say: **one may not** even **add** to a pre-existing hole to widen it.

PEREK 22 – 146A

And everyone agrees that one may bore an old hole that had been sealed up, to re-open it, and this is **completely permitted**. It is not considered to be like making an opening, since the opening has already been made. And the seal does not nullify the original opening.

And the Gemara asks: **and** according to the view of **the first Tanna** who permits one to add: **why may one not make a new hole** on Shabbat? **Because he is making an opening**. Is not **adding** to the opening **also making an opening**? And this is considered to be putting the finishing touch to a utensil.

Said Rabbah: by Torah law, any opening that is not made for bringing things in and taking things out, is not an opening. One is not liable in such a case for improving the utensil. Therefore, there is no prohibition by Torah law to make this kind of an opening in a utensil on Shabbat. For it is only made for taking things out but not for bringing them in. However, **the Rabbis made a decree** regarding all utensils, **because** if they permitted one to make an opening in these utensils, he might come to make an opening in a **chicken coop**. And the opening of a chicken coop is considered to be an opening according to Torah law, as it is made to bring things in and to take them out, since **it is made to bring up air** into the coop, and to **take out** bad **vapors** from it to the outside.

And concerning utensils, since it is only prohibited to make an opening because of this decree, they only applied the decree to the making of new openings. **But if one comes to add** to a pre-existing one, **he may add**. Regarding adding to openings, there is no need for a decree lest one do the same thing with chicken coops. For with regards to **adding**, **one would certainly not come to add to a chicken coop's** opening, **because** a large opening would allow **creeping creatures** to enter and kill the chickens.

PEREK 22 – 146B

Ammud Bet

It was taught above: **And others say: one may not even add** to a pre-existing hole to widen it.

And the Gemara explains their reason: the Rabbis were concerned even about adding to a chicken coop's opening. Because **sometimes he does not initially make** the opening of the chicken coop big enough, **and he may come to widen it** on Shabbat.

Rav Nachman expounded in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: the Halachah is like the statement in the name of **“others say”**. Thus one may not even add to an opening to widen it.

It was taught above: **And everyone agrees that one may bore an old hole** that had been sealed up, to re-open it, and this is **completely permitted**.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: it was only taught that one may re-open a hole **in a place** where the seal of **the old hole was made** in order **to preserve** the aroma of the wine, so that it does not evaporate. Since it is not a tight seal, it is considered as if the opening is still present. And now when he bores it a second time it is not considered like he has made an opening.

But if the seal was made **to strengthen** the utensil so that the wine does not come out, it **is prohibited** to open it on Shabbat. Since it is a tight seal, the old hole is nullified, and it is as if he is making a new opening.

PEREK 22 – 146B

And the Gemara asks: **what is the case of a seal made ‘to preserve’ the aroma? And what is the case of a seal made ‘to strengthen’ the utensil?**

Said Rav Chisda: if the hole is **above** the level of **the wine**, **this is** considered to be a seal made **‘to preserve’** the aroma. This shows that when he sealed it, he only did so in order to preserve the aroma of the wine, since the wine anyway can not go out through the hole. And there is no need to make a seal to strengthen the utensil in such a case.

But if the hole is **below** the place where **the wine** is situated, **this is** considered to be a seal made **‘to strengthen’** the utensil, so that the wine will not go out through the hole.

Said Rabbah: a seal **below the wine is also made to preserve** the aroma, since the weight of the wine is not pressing on it. It is enough to make a flimsy seal to stop the wine coming out. And this type of seal does not nullify the opening and does not render it as if it is closed.

And what is the case of a seal made to strengthen the utensil?

For example, where he bored the barrel at its bottom, below where the dregs are situated. Since the whole weight of the wine is pressing there, he seals it with a tight seal.

*

Abaye said to Rabbah: there is a **Baraita that supports you**, that only a tight seal nullifies the opening of a utensil.

By way of introduction: The area of a courtyard is divided according to the number of doors opening onto it. That is, if a jointly owned courtyard has many owners whose houses open onto the courtyard, then when the owners come to divide the courtyard amongst themselves, they accord ownership of four *amot*⁵ in the courtyard next to each

⁵ 1 ammah: 18.7 in., 48 cm

PEREK 22 – 146B

door, even if one house has several doors. Consequently, a house that has many doors receives more of the courtyard than a house with only one door. And the rest of the courtyard is divided equally between the owners.

And it was taught in a Baraita: the owner of a **house** whose door **is sealed**, still **owns four amot** next to its entrance. For any door whose frame is still intact, is considered to be a door even when it is sealed.

But if **he smashed its frame** and then sealed it, **he does not own the four amot**, since it can no longer be considered to be a door.

And similarly: a house with no door, which has a corpse inside of it, is considered to be like a grave. Thus it imparts impurity to the four *amot* that surrounds the house. And the Rabbis made a decree lest one come to make an *ohel*⁶ over the grave inadvertently.

And a **house** whose door **is sealed** and has a corpse inside of it, **does not impart impurity to all its sides**, since it is still considered to be have a door, and it is not like a grave.

But if **he smashed its frame** and then sealed it, **it does impart impurity to the four amot of all its sides**, since it is like a grave. This is because it is no longer considered to be a door.

We see from all this as follows: anything that does not have a tight seal is still considered an opening. And this would also be the case regarding the opening of a barrel on Shabbat.

⁶ Lit. “a tent”, i.e. something positioned horizontally over a source of impurity, which contracts impurity, and causes the spread of impurity to whatever else is under the *ohel*.

PEREK 22 – 146B

Regarding a **hollow reed** – **Rav prohibits** a person to insert it into the hole of a barrel on Shabbat in order to take out the wine through it. **And Shmuel permits** a person to do this.

And the Gemara explains: if **he initially cuts** the reed in order to make it the correct size for the hole, **everyone agrees that it is prohibited**, since cutting is a primary form of prohibited work.

And if the reed had already been inserted into the hole, and it came out, and he came **to return it** (to the hole) on Shabbat, **everyone agrees that it is permitted**.

The case **where they disagree** is with regards to a hollow reed **that** had already been **cut**, and is the right size for the hole, but had not been **set up** yet. I.e. it had not been put into the hole to see if it is indeed exactly the right size or not.

The one who prohibits it holds that the Rabbis made a decree on it. For if one is permitted to insert it for the first time on Shabbat, **perhaps** he will see that the reed is not the precise size, and **might even come to cut it in the first place**.

And the one who permits it, holds that the Rabbis **did not make a decree** on it.

And this disagreement is **similar to a disagreement of Tannaim**.

For it was taught in a Baraita: **one may not cut a hollow reed on Yom Tov**. **And it is unnecessary to say** that one may not cut it **on Shabbat** as this receives a more severe punishment.

And if the hollow reed had already been inserted into the barrel from before Shabbat, and **fell out**, **one may return it** to its place **on Shabbat**. **And it is unnecessary to say** that one may return it **on Yom Tov**.

PEREK 22 – 146B

And Rabbi Yoshia is lenient.

And the Gemara analyses the Baraita: **to what** part of the Baraita **was Rabbi Yoshia's** statement referring?

If you say it is referring **to the first clause**, and is coming to teach that it is completely permitted to cut it, one can not say this. For as **this would be** considered to be **putting the finishing touch to a utensil**, which is prohibited by Torah law.

Rather, Rabbi Yoshia's statement was referring **to the end clause**. And comes to teach that if it falls out, it is permitted to return it on Shabbat.

And the Gemara asks further: **but the first Tanna also permits** this. How then does Rabbi Yoshia disagree with the first Tanna?

Rather, it must be that **the difference between them** is concerning the case **where** the reed had been **cut** before Shabbat, **but had not** yet been **set up**. One **master** (the first Tanna) **holds that** the Rabbis **made a decree** lest he come to cut it in the first place. And this is similar to Rav's view.

And the other **master**, Rav Oshia, **holds that** the Rabbis **did not make such a decree**. And this is similar to Shmuel's view.

Rav Shisha son of Rav Idi expounded in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: the Halachah is in accordance with Rav Yoshia, and the Rabbis do not make a decree lest he come to cut it in the first place.

PEREK 22 – 146B

It was stated in the Mishnah: **and if it**, the barrel, **was** already bored, **one may not put wax on it**, i.e. on the hole. **Because** by doing so **he smears** it around the hole, and it is considered a secondary form of the forbidden work of smoothing.

Regarding **thick oil** – **Rav prohibits** a person to smear it on Shabbat. **And Shmuel permits** a person to smear it.

And the Gemara explains: everyone agrees that with thick oil, by Torah law there is no prohibition of smoothing. Because smearing is only applicable to something that is very thick, such as wax. However, **the one who prohibits it** holds that the Rabbis **made a decree** on it, **because** if we permitted him to do it, he may even come to smear **wax**. **And the one who permits it** holds the Rabbis **did not make** such a decree.

Rav Shmuel bar Chanah said to Rav Yosef: you told us explicitly in the name of Rav that regarding **thick oil, it is permitted** to smear it on Shabbat. So we see that he holds that the Rabbis did not make a decree on it. So how could we say that Rav prohibited this?

Said Tavot Rishba⁷ in the name of Shmuel: regarding **a myrtle leaf, it is prohibited** to make it curved and to fashion it into a gutter shape and to put it into the hole of a barrel, so that the wine will flow down it.

What is the reason that it is prohibited? **Rav Yeimar from Difti said: a decree** was made lest one come to fashion **a gutter** on Shabbat.

⁷ A man named Tavot who used to spread nets (*Rishba*) to hunt animals and birds

PEREK 22 – 146B

Rav Ashi said: a decree was made, **lest one come to pluck** a leaf off a myrtle branch for such a purpose. And it would be like putting the finishing touches to a utensil⁸.

And the Gemara asks: **What is the difference between them**, these two reasons?

And the Gemara answers: **the difference between them** is concerning a case where there are many leaves **that have been cut and are lying** on the floor. According to Rav Ashi, it would be permitted to put one of the leaves in the hole. For if one breaks he can take another one, and he will not come to pluck one from the branch. But according to Rav Yeimar, even in this case it is prohibited, because he may come to fashion a gutter.

Regarding sheets of **felt** that one folds to be used as a pillow or cushion – **Rav prohibits** one to wrap himself up in it like a cloak and to go out into the public domain with it. **And Shmuel permits it.**

And the Gemara explains: **regarding soft felt, everyone agrees that it is permitted.** For it is normal to wrap oneself up in it to keep warm, and it is not considered carrying a burden, rather an article of clothing.

And **regarding stiff felt, everyone agrees that it is prohibited.** For it is not the usual way of wearing clothes, but it is like taking out a burden into the public domain.

Where they disagree is with regards to felt of average softness. In truth, it is considered like clothing. Nevertheless, **the one who prohibits it** holds that the Rabbis made a decree on it because **it has the appearance of a burden**, since it is a bit stiff. **And the one who permits it** holds that **it does not have the appearance of a burden.**

⁸ This is speaking of a case where the myrtle branch was already detached from the tree before Shabbat.

PEREK 22 – 146B

And this statement in the name of **Rav**, that it is prohibited, **it was not stated explicitly**. **Rather, it was stated based on an inference** drawn from a certain incident involving Rav.

For Rav visited a certain place that did not have enough space for him to gather with his disciples and teach them. **He went out and sat in a *carmelit*** (a place that is neither a public nor a private domain by Torah law. But the Sages gave it the stringencies of both domains). **They brought out**, by way of wearing, **some average pieces of felt** for him to sit on, **and he did not sit** on them.

Someone who saw this incident **thought** that the reason Rav did not sit on them was because he held **that it is prohibited** to take out such **felt** on Shabbat, even by way of wearing.

And this is not so, for Rav declared: average felt is permitted. And he held that the Rabbis did not make a decree on it. And it was **because of respect for the scholars** who were with him that **he did not sit on it**. For they did not have anything to sit on and were sitting on the ground and he did not want to elevate himself over them.

And who were these scholars? **Rav Kahana and Rav Asi**, who were disciples and colleagues of Rav.

MISHNAH

1. **One may put a cooked food into a pit** (that has no water) **so that it** may be **preserved** and not go bad from the heat.

PEREK 22 – 146B

And similarly, one may put a utensil of **potable water inside** some cold, **non-potable** water **so that it cools** the potable water.

And similarly, one may put something **cold in the sun, so that it should become hot.**

2. **Someone whose clothes fell** into water **while** he was **on the road, may walk in them** while they are wet, **and need not be concerned.**

And when **he reaches the outer courtyard** of the town, which is a guarded place, **he may spread them out** in private to dry them **in the sun.**

But he may not spread them out **before the people** i.e. in public, so that they do not suspect him of washing clothes on Shabbat.

GEMARA

It was stated in the Mishnah: one may put a cooked food into a pit.

And the Gemara asks: **it is obvious.** What prohibition could he be transgressing?

And the Gemara answers: **you might have said** that the Rabbis **should have made a decree** lest one come to level out the ground of the pit, so that it can be flat to place a pot on. And this is a secondary form of the prohibited work of Plowing. The Mishnah **informs us** that the Rabbis did not make such a decree.

PEREK 22 – 146B

It was stated in the Mishnah: one may put a utensil of **potable water inside** some cold, **non-potable** water.

And the Gemara asks: **it is obvious**. Why should it be prohibited?

And the Gemara answers: this law was taught because of the end clause of the Mishnah. **And the end clause was needed** to teach us that one may put something **cold in the sun**.

And the Gemara asks further: **this law is also obvious**. Cooking by the sun is not considered to be cooking.

And the Gemara answers: **you might have said** that the Rabbis **should have made a decree, lest he comes to bury** something **in hot ash**, and he will transgress the prohibition of cooking. The Mishnah **informs us** that the Rabbis did not make such a decree.

It was stated in the Mishnah: **Someone whose clothes fell** into water... He may spread them out in private to dry them in the sun. But he may not spread them out before the people.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: everywhere that the Sages prohibited an act **because of the appearance** of wrongdoing, **it is prohibited even in inner rooms** i.e. in complete private.

And the Gemara raises a difficulty: But surely **it was taught** in our Mishnah: **“he may spread them out** in private to dry them **in the sun. But he may not** spread them out **before the people.”** And this prohibition is also because of the appearance of wrongdoing, so that they should not suspect him of washing clothes on Shabbat. So we

PEREK 22 – 146B

see that the Sages only prohibited this in public, but in private where he can not be seen, it is permitted.

And the Gemara answers: **this is a Tannaic disagreement. For it was taught** in a Baraita: **one may spread them out** in private to dry them **in the sun. But he may not** spread them out **before the people.**

Rabbi Elazar and Rabbi Shimon prohibit it even in private. And Rav holds in accordance with their view.